

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Per Examiner T.D. Wessendorf on 7/11/06 Please return. First page serial # does NOT match second page Serial Number.

Mankyou,

Schwegman, Lundberg, Woessner & Kluth, P.A.

JUL 0 6 2006

INTELLEVATE JUL 0 6 2006

Advisory Action W 2 4 2005

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/190,425	BROWN ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
T. D. Wessendorf	1639

Potoro the Filing of an Armool Prioti					
Before the Filing of an Africa Brief	Examiner	Art Unit			
	T. D. Wessendorf	1639			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address					
THE REPLY FILED <u>24 May 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN					
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL					
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on 24 May 2006. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because					
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or 					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):					
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: none.					
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-4,6,10,31 and 33.					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 7,9, 1 1, 1 7-20,30 and 32. AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
B. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).					
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).					
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER					
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet. 	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:		
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).					
13.		T. D. Wessendorf Primary Examiner			
		Art Unit: 1639 6/28/66			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05)

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Part of Paper No. 25

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons set forth in the last office action. For example, under 35 USC 112, applicants argue that the cells such as progenitor cells and differentiated cells, inter alia are exemplified. However, the specification, page 10, paragraph [38]defines cells including, inter alia, organisms, a single type cell derived from an organism, mixture of cell types. Thus, the argued specific progenitor cells does not describe adequately the genus live cells. Livewise, the argued polypeptide probes would not provide for the genus probes, which can include structurally different compounds such as nucleic acids. The 35 USC 103 is maintained for reasons set forth in the last Office action. The claimed method step comprising simply the single contacting step do not distinguish over the combined teachings of the prior ar. The prior art teaches determination of live and dead cells.